

Remarks

This is in response to the final Office Action mailed on April 1, 2005. Claims 1, 7, 8, and 16 are amended, support for the amendments being found, for example, at page 9, line 13 through page 11, line 1, and at Figure 3 of the present application. No new matter is added. Claims 1-21 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested for the following reasons.

I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,134,603, in view of Fox, U.S. Patent No. 6,151,700. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded. Reconsideration is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a computer implemented method of activating a requested processing component initiated by a calling component within a local computing system having one or more applications. Claim 1 recites activating an instance of an application associated with one or more processing components, and receiving a request from a calling component to activate one of the processing components associated with the application. Claim 1 further recites that, if configuration data indicates that the requested component is a private component, performing the following: determining if the requested component is a member of the application that also includes the calling component as a member; and if the requested component and the calling component are members of the same application, activating an instance of the requested component.

An advantage associated with such a method is that activation of a component of an application can be governed based on the designation of the component as public or private. See, for example, application, p. 9, l. 20 - p. 11, l. 1.

The accuracy of the rejection's characterization of Jones is not conceded. However, the rejection concedes that Jones fails to disclose a private component. The rejection cites Fox as disclosing the subject matter that is missing in Jones. The rejection's characterization of Fox is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Fox discloses that a developer can define objects during program design in which all or some of the data variables and all or some of the related methods are considered "private" for use only by the object itself. Fox, col. 4, ll. 19-25. In other words, Fox discloses the ability to define variables as public or private during programming and prior to compilation of the code for an object. See Fox, col. 4, ll. 27-30. If an attempt is made in the code to directly access private variables, an error occurs during compilation of the code, stopping the compilation process before an executable object is created. Fox, col. 4, ll. 30-34.

Fox fails to disclose or suggest a method of activating a requested processing component including activating an instance of an application associated with one or more processing components, and if configuration data indicates that a requested component is a private component, determining if the requested component is a member of the application that also includes the calling component as a member, and if the requested component and the calling component are members of the same application, activating an instance of the requested component, as recited by claim 1. In contrast, Fox discloses checking the status of the variables during compilation rather than after activation of an application, as recited by claim 1. Any combination of Fox with Jones would therefore not result in the method as recited in claim 1 because neither reference discloses or suggests activating a requested component of an activated application based on the component's public-private status.

For at least these reasons, neither Jones nor Fox, alone or in combination, discloses the method recited by claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, as well as claims 2-6 that depend therefrom, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 7 recites a computer implemented method of activating a requested processing component initiated by a calling component within a local computing system having one or more applications. Claim 8 recites a computer program data product readable by a computing system and encoding instructions for a method for activating a requested processing component initiated by a calling component within a local computing system having one or more applications. For at least reasons similar to those provide above with respect to claim 1, neither Jones nor Fox, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests a computer implemented method or a computer program data product as recited by claims 7 and 8. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 7 and 8, as well as claims 9-15 that depend from claim 8, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 16 recites a computing system for activating a requested processing component initiated by a calling component within a local computing system having one or more applications. Claim 16 recites, among other limitations, an activated application associated with one or more processing components, and a permit object activation module for determining whether an instance of the requested component may be activated, the permit object activation module using a value of a public/private property to determine whether the request component may be activated. For at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1, neither Jones nor Fox, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests a computing system as recited by claim 16. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 16, as well as claims 17-21 that depend therefrom, are therefore respectfully requested.


II. Conclusion

The remarks set forth above provide certain arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claims. There may be other reasons that the pending claims are patentably distinct over the cited references, and the right to raise any such other reasons or arguments in the future is expressly reserved.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding this matter, please call the undersigned at 612.332.5300.

Respectfully submitted,
Merchant & Gould P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
612.332.5300

Date: June 21, 2005


Name: Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No.: 50,471
RAK